



MAR 20 2002

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

Antoinette F. Konski  
McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enersen LLP  
3 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800  
San Francisco, CA 94111

In re Application of JEN et al  
U.S. Application No.: 09/646,478  
Int. Application No.: PCT/US99/06947  
Int. Filing Date: 30 March 1999  
Priority Date: 31 March 1998  
Attorney Docket No.: 126881201800  
For: METHODS FOR THE DIAGNOSIS AND  
TREATMENT OF LUNG CANCER

DECISION

This is in response to applicants' "Renewed Request Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.497(d) and Petition for Suspension of the Rules Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.183" filed 04 March 2002.

### **BACKGROUND**

On 30 March 1999, applicants filed international application PCT/US99/06947, which claimed priority of an earlier United States application filed 31 March 1998. A Demand for international preliminary examination, in which the United States was elected, was filed on 12 October 1999, prior to the expiration of nineteen months from the priority date. Accordingly, the thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired at midnight on 30 September 2000.

On 15 September 2000, applicants filed national stage papers in the United States. The submission was accompanied by, *inter alia*, the basic national fee required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1).

On 13 October 2000, the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905), indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497 must be filed along with a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.492(e) for providing the oath or declaration later than thirty (30) months from the priority date.

On 17 January 2001, applicants filed a "Response to Notice of Missing Requirements" which included, *inter alia*, a declaration, an assignment document, and the required late declaration surcharge.

On 20 April 2001, the DO/EO/US mailed a Notification of a Defective Response (Form PCT/DO/EO/916) along with a Notification of a Defective Oath or Declaration (Form PCT/DO/EO/917) indicating that the declaration filed 17 January 2001 is improper since the declaration lists an inventor who is not listed on the international application.

On 21 May 2001, applicants filed a request to correct inventorship under 37 CFR 1.497(d).

On 14 August 2001, this Office mailed a decision dismissing the 21 May 2001 request to correct inventorship.

On 04 March 2002, applicants filed the present renewed request under 37 CFR 1.497(d) along with new declarations.

### **DISCUSSION**

The declarations filed 04 March 2002 are in proper format and list David Sidransky as an additional inventor beyond those indicated in the international application.

37 CFR 1.497(d) (effective 07 November 2000) states,

If the oath or declaration filed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(4) and this section names an inventive entity different from the inventive entity set forth in the international application, the oath or declaration must be accompanied by: (1) a statement from each person being added as an inventor and from each person being deleted as an inventor that any error in inventorship in the international application occurred without deceptive intention on his or her part; (2) the processing fee set forth in § 1.17(i); and (3) if an assignment has been executed by any of the original named inventors, the written consent of the assignee (see § 3.73(b) of this chapter).

With regard to item (1) above, applicants have provided the requisite statement from the purported inventor Sidransky.

With regard to item (2) above, the requisite fee has been provided.

With regard to item (3) above, the assignee must establish ownership of the application in order to consent to a correction of inventorship. See MPEP 324. On 30 March 2001, applicants filed a "Prosecution by Assignee and Power of Attorney Under 37 C.F.R. § 3.71" which states that AgraQuest, Inc. is the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the present application.

Under 37 CFR 3.73(b)(1), ownership of the application may be established by: (i) submitting documentary evidence of a chain of title from the original owner to the assignee; or (ii) specifying by reel and frame number where such evidence is recorded in the USPTO. In the

present case, applicants have not provided documentary evidence of a chain of title from each of the inventors to AgraQuest, Inc., nor have applicants specified by reel and frame number where such evidence is recorded in the USPTO.

It is further noted that the consent statements filed with the renewed request do not state that the persons signing the statements are authorized to act on behalf of AgraQuest, Inc., nor are the consent statements signed by persons with apparent authority to sign on behalf of AgraQuest, Inc. See 37 CFR 3.73(b)(2).

### **CONCLUSION**

Because applicants have failed to satisfy item (3) above, the renewed request under 37 CFR 1.497(d) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this decision is desired, a proper response must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Failure to timely file a proper response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Request Under 37 CFR 1.497(d)" and should also properly establish consent of the assignee as discussed above. Extensions of time may be obtained pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Please direct further correspondence with respect to this matter to the Commissioner for Patents, Box PCT, Washington, D.C. 20231, and address the contents of the letter to the attention of the PCT Legal Office.



Bryan Tung  
PCT Legal Examiner  
PCT Legal Office

Telephone: 703-308-6614  
Facsimile: 703-308-6459